

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 14 are pending. Claims 1 and 8 are currently amended. New claim 14 has been added.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,932,897 (Kawaguchi et al.).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the drain region is in direct contact with the drift region. An example of that is shown in FIG. 7 of the present application where, drain region 12 (P+) is in direct contact with drift region 4 (LP). Semiconductor devices implementing that feature may be advantageously more compact and simpler in construction. The Kawaguchi et al. patent does not disclose that feature.

The Kawaguchi et al. patent discloses a p-type semiconductor substrate 11, a gate insulating film 17 and a field oxide film 18. (*See* FIG. 3) A gate electrode 19 spans from the gate insulating film 17 to the field oxide film 18. An n-type source layer 13 is located near the gate electrode. An n-type drain layer 16 is formed a distance from the gate electrode 19. A first n-type offset layer 14 is located around the drain layer 16. A second n-type offset layer 15 is adjacent the drain layer 16. The second n-type offset layer 15 has a higher dosage than the first n-type offset layer 14 (*see* column 5, lines 61-64). The first n-type offset layer 14 extends deeper into the semiconductor substrate 11 than the second n-type offset layer 15.

However, in the Kawaguchi et al. patent, the drain layer 16 is not in direct contact with the first n-type offset layer 14. Instead, the drain layer 16 is separated from the first n-type offset layer 14 by the second n-type offset layer 15.

Claim 1 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant : Shuichi Kikuchi et al.
Serial No. : 10/651,855
Filed : August 29, 2003
Page : 6 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-057002 / F51-
160880M/SW

Claims 8-10 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Kawaguchi et al. patent. Claim 8 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 should be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Enclosed is a \$790 check for filing a Request for Continued Examination. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Shuichi Kikuchi et al.
Serial No. : 10/651,855
Filed : August 29, 2003
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-057002 / F51-
160880M/SW

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/16/05



Samuel Borodach
Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291

30244445.doc